



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,903	08/19/2005	Danny Louis Cornelius Morlion	003D.0049.U1(US)	7558
29683 7590 06/19/2007 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/523,903

Applicant(s)

MORLION

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-10-2007 filing of an RCE.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ ~~Notice of Disposition with Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)~~
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to filling of RCE in this case.

Specification page 4, line 33, numerals 7, 13 seem incorrect and line 35, and numeral 8 should be added.

1. Claims 8, 9, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larabell in view of Spagnaletti and Shechter.
2. For claims 8, 12, Larabell discussed previously includes all features recited but does not include means as recited in claim 8, lines 14-16. It would have been obvious to omit the portion of power line 40 that continues to connector 13 and cable 80. If part 90 were self-powered, the power from 70 would be used only to operate the circuits at 20, 36. This would save expense. Shechter, figure 1 at 4, 6, 8 and Spagnaletti, figures 2, 3, 4, 7 show that repeaters require power but are basically only for transmission of data to the end or third part. It would have been obvious to also form Larabell repeater to transmit only data. For claim 9, change of ground to a power contact provides no structural distinction over a power contact. Claim 11 met by Larabell circuit.
3. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Krakovich and Martin.
4. For claims 9, 10, etc, Larabell does not clearly depict contacts and a circuit board. Krakovich at 2b, 2 and Martin figure 1A shown these features. Obvious to use these type features in Larabell as these standard electronic components. Claims 8, 12 included in case issues arise. These aspects of the rejection do not appear to be at issue.


Art Unit: 2839

5. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCTWO 97/06514 in view of Krakovich, Larabell and Martin.

6. PCT shows a system with first part 4, a second part 1 joined to cable 2 and having a circuit 9, a first part power line 6 and circuit lines 7, 8 and corresponding second part circuit lines, the second part being powered from line 6 but with only data sent on cable 2. PCT does not clearly depict contacts and a circuit board. Krakovich and Martin depict these features and this use is also suggested by Larabell. Obvious to use such features in PCT (contacts at 5, 6, 7, 8), as these are standard, and not shown in PCT only since that disclosure is schematic. Claim 11 reads on component 9.

7. Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The feature at issue is seen to be an obvious variation as noted above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER